DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 174 SP 033 157

AUTHOR Hollingsworth, Sandra
TITLE Narrative Analysis in Literacy Education: A Story of Changing Classroom Practices. Research Series No. 202.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 24p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034 ($3.00).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; Educational Change; Elementary Education; *Epistemology; *Feminism; Higher Education; *Methods Courses; Models; *Personal Narratives; Reading Instruction; Research Methodology; *Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Responsibility; Teaching Methods; *Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

With the historical difficulty of changing classroom practices as background, this paper represents a teacher educator's critical investigation of the outcomes of her own instructional practices. Grounded in critical feminist theory, the narrative inquiry critiques epistemological stances taken over 4 years by a literacy educator for elementary teachers. The narrative describes various paradigm shifts which led to new perspectives on the researcher's sense of responsibility as a teacher educator. It tells the story of how she began her work with a sense of instructional responsibility to develop subject or content expertise in teachers, then how she reframed her responsibility in terms of influencing a transfer of that expertise to children. Continued research into new teachers' efforts to change or adapt to existing classroom practices after they had left the teacher education program led to the final paradigm shift. The conclusion of the narrative describes how the teacher educator's investigations into her own practices changed her sense of responsibility from one of cognitive change in new teachers to epistemological change. A discussion of case examples within each paradigm, their respective outcomes on changing new teachers' classroom practices, and lessons that the teacher educator learned in the analysis are included. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

IRt Price
$3.00

Research Series No. 202

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS IN LITERACY EDUCATION: A STORY OF CHANGING CLASSROOM PRACTICES

Sandra Hollingsworth

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P Peterson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP033157

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research Series No. 202

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS IN LITERACY EDUCATION: A STORY OF CHANGING CLASSROOM PRACTICES

Sandra Hollingsworth

Published by

The Institute for Research on Teaching
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

May 1991

This work is sponsored in part by the Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching is funded from a variety of federal, state, and private sources including the United States Department of Education and Michigan State University. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the funding agencies.

Institute for Research on Teaching

The Institute for Research on Teaching was founded in 1976 at Michigan State University and has been the recipient of major federal grants. Funding for IRT projects is currently received from the U.S. Department of Education, Michigan State University, and other agencies and foundations. IRT scholars have conducted major research projects aimed at improving classroom teaching, including studies of classroom management strategies, student socialization, the diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties, and school policies. IRT researchers have also been examining the teaching of specific school subjects such as reading, writing, general mathematics, and science and are seeking to understand how factors inside as well as outside the classroom affect teachers. In addition to curriculum and instructional specialists in school subjects, researchers from such diverse disciplines as educational psychology, anthropology, sociology, history, economics, and philosophy cooperate in conducting IRT research. By focusing on how teachers respond to enduring problems of practice and by collaborating with practitioners, IRT researchers strive to produce new understandings to improve teaching and teacher education.

Currently, IRT researchers are engaged in a number of programmatic efforts in research on teaching that build on past work and extend the study of teaching in new directions such as the teaching of subject matter disciplines in elementary school, teaching in developing countries, and teaching special populations. New modes of teacher collaboration with schools and teachers' organizations are also being explored. The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement from 1987-92, is one of the IRT's major endeavors and emphasizes the teaching of elementary mathematics, science, social studies, literature, and the arts for understanding, appreciation, and use. The focus is on what content should be taught, how teachers concentrate their teaching to use their limited resources in the best way, and in what ways good teaching is subject-matter specific.

The IRT publishes research reports, occasional papers, conference proceedings, the Elementary Subjects Center Series, a newsletter for practitioners (IRT Communication Quarterly), and lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, and/or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-directors:	Jere E. Brophy and Penelope L. Peterson
Senior Researchers:	Linda Alford, Janet Alleman, Tane Akamatsu, Charles Anderson, Linda Anderson, Betsy Becker, Margret Buchmann, Patricia Cianciolo, Gerald Duffy, Carol Sue Englert, James Gallagher, James Gavelek, Sandra Hollingsworth, Magdalene Lampert, Perry Lanier, Wanda May, Richard Navarro, Annemarie Palincsar, Richard Prawat, Ralph Putnam, Taffy Raphael, Stephen Raudenbush, Laura Roehler, Cheryl Rosaen, Kathleen Roth, William Schmidt, John Schwille, David Stewart, M. Teresa Tatto, Mun Tsang, Christopher Wheeler, Suzanne Wilson
Editor:	Sandra Gross
Editorial Assistant:	Brian H. Bode

Abstract

With the historical difficulty of changing classroom practices as background, this paper represents a teacher educator's critical investigation of the outcomes of her own instructional practices. Grounded in critical feminist theory, the author uses narrative inquiry to contain and critique varying epistemological stances she took across a span of four years with respect to her responsibility as a literacy educator for elementary teachers. The analysis is supported by data from a line of separate investigations (reported elewhere and summarized here) which illustrate the efficacy of each approach in terms of changing new teachers' classroom practices.

The narrative describes various paradigm shifts which led to new perspectives on the author's sense of responsibility as a teacher educator. It tells the story of how she began her work with a sense of instructional responsibility to develop subject or content expertise in teachers, then how she came to reframe her responsibility in terms of influencing a transfer of that expertise to children. Continued research into new teachers' efforts to change or adapt to existing clasroom practices after they left the teacher education program led to the final paradigm shift. The conclusion of the narrative describes how the teacher educator's investigations into her own practices changed her sense of responsibility from one of cognitive change in new teachers, to epistemological change. A discussion of case examples within each paradigm, their respective outcomes on changing new teachers' classroom practices, and lessons that the teacher educator learned in the analysis are included.

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS IN LITERACY EDUCATION: A STORY OF CHANGING CLASSROOM PRACTICES[1]

Sandra Hollingsworth[2]

> It should come as no surprise that many reforms seldom go beyond getting adopted as a policy. Most get implemented in word rather than deed, especially in classrooms. . . . Seldom are the deepest structures of schooling that are embedded in the school's use of time and space, teaching practices and teaching routines fundamentally altered even at those historical moments when reforms seek those alterations as the goal. (Cuban, 1990, p. 9)

At first reading, this amazing stability in classroom practice seems unbelievable--especially considering recent history--when many recommendations for changing practices have come from research on teaching and teacher education (Houston, Haberman, & Sikula, 1990; Wittrock, 1986). However, research does exist in those same areas which lends credence to Cuban's analysis. Administrative and materials-driven mandates for reform based on research findings in elementary reading instruction, for example, *do* change teachers' practices, but only temporarily--until a new round of recommendations and/or teaching evaluations dictate change in another direction (Hollingsworth et al., 1991). Statistically, such variation would suggest a regression to the mean. Indeed, that has been the case in studies of variation in reading instruction (Bond & Dykstra, 1967).

Looking beyond studies of classroom practices to teacher education practices provides even more evidence of stability in the face of recommendations for reform (Borrowman, 1965; Lanier & Little, 1986). There are also thoughtful studies of the difficulty of preparing new teachers (Zeichner & Gore, 1990) or reeducating experienced teachers (Guskey, 1986) to change their practices substantially. And when changes in teacher educators' practices are attempted through

---

[1]This paper was originally presented at the National Reading Conference in Miami in November 1990 and also presented to the Department of Women's Studies at Michigan State University in February 1990.

[2]Sandra Hollingsworth, assistant professor of teacher education at Michigan State University, is a senior researcher in the Institute for Research on Teaching working on the Students' Response to Literature Instruction Project.

new program designs to accommodate such findings, there is very little evidence of the effect of those practices through follow-up studies of program graduates.

Cuban's article implicitly challenges those of us who are teacher educators to look critically at the outcomes of our own practices. I offer this paper in the spirit of that challenge. It is a summary of systematic investigations (using varying approaches) to locate the outcomes of my course work and suggest course revisions. Because this is a critique of my own practice, it requires a format and style which may be new to many in the field. Though it may disturb and challenge those who read it, I extend an invitation to read on--to step into the unfamiliar in search of a common goal: seeking new possibilities for changing classroom practice and connecting with the students inside them. I will frame the findings from earlier studies within the broad parameters of narrative inquiry to interweave the varying instructional methods, outcome measures, and analysis procedures I've used.

The narration in first person not only locates me as narrator and avoids the awkwardness of referring to myself in the third person but makes my thoughts as vulnerable or open to examination as the thoughts of the teachers and students with whom I have worked. To avoid the pitfalls of becoming locked within familiar paradigms where I find what I expect to see, both format and style are grounded in the "new eyes" of critical feminist theory (Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi, 1981). In the tradition of feminist methodology, if my goal is to have others change their thinking and/or their practices, I must begin with an honest examination of the success and failures I have experienced with respect to those goals. Since even my goals have changed over time, I will organize the narrative in terms of my evolving beliefs about the responsibilities of a teacher educator. Perhaps my story will be similar enough to parts of other teacher educators' experiences so that we can collectively examine the distinct but complementary roles and responsibilities we have both as individuals and as a field--and the possibility of contributing to a different history of classroom practice.

Narrative Inquiry

Because of the narrative approach's relative novelty in the field of educational research, I will begin by building a case for it which organizes the separate analyses on which this paper is based. Narrative method is the description and restorying of experience using narrative structure (Connelly & Clandinin, 1986). The universality of the story form makes it available for meaningful generalization by others. Even though story audiences may embrace alternative methodological stances or ways of knowing, they can connect through both the familiar framework of the narrative and common experiences within it. The generalization we seek from educational inquiry, in fact, may take its broadest reach when cast in story form. Where positivistic analyses often seem appropriate to locate cognitive or rational rules for generalization in mathematically ordered worlds, they are often frustratingly limited in the messier human worlds of classrooms. Positivist generalizations alone often seem too narrowly focused to be useful to teachers. Narrative inquiry gives permission to include but extend that intellectual boundary.

While other methods have served me well for more focused questions about my work, narrative inquiry allows me to stop and take stock of cumulative and larger research problems. Freed from constraints to adopt an a priori perspective and describe my work from a single dispassionate voice, I can use the personal and temporal fluctuations embedded in narrative structure to describe the various perspectives I've taken, incorporating multiple voices and contradictory stances. I can tell my story as a literacy teacher educator while weaving in examples of its shaping by others' stories--particularly those of my teachers and students. I can look backwards to uncover the issues and lessons learned thus far and use those lessons to shape my future work.

I've found a narrative approach to research not only methodologically but personally satisfying. That satisfaction comes from grounding my cognitive processing in the spiritual, intuitive, moral, and emotional processes which help me integrate and understand new information (Mitchell, 1980). When I read or hear a story which resinates in me as being true, the "truth"

results from an interaction between the analytic and language skills of the storyteller and the images raised which relate to my own life. This perceived understanding escapes the bounds of language and logic. Yet such perception has been supported theoretically in respected psychological work (e.g., Gilligan, 1982; Vygotsky, 1962). It may be particularly valuable for me as a woman.

As I am coming to know myself as a feminist educator, I am pulled toward methods which explicitly make room for values and perspectives typically associated with women's socialized experiences (and employed by teachers--male and female). Narrative method requires analysis in terms of connection and response; it is an intimate rather than objective analysis of justice and productivity, right and wrong. Outcomes from narrative inquiries lead to understanding and new directions rather than explanation and prescription. Viewed through feminist theory, the narrative voice must be a critically compassionate one, and the researcher must be placed in as critical a perspective as the researched. Again, such explication may cause those unfamiliar with feminist critique and methodology some discomfort. However, voicing the value of such a perspective seems important to widen the circle of educational research so that previously unvoiced perspectives can be included.

Restorying through narrative inquiry helps both pull together and direct the changing perspectives and methodological variations which accompany a line of work. Through narrative, the experiential wholeness of investigative programs can be caringly preserved, rather than fragmented into decontextualized parts. It is partially because of that wholeness that narrative becomes a familiar format against which readers can begin to raise questions about their own perspectives and practices. As stories from various research paradigms are interwoven, the full fabric of the story might suggest ways to build a narrative unity which comes from the freedom of inclusion: the opportunity to find out how individual methods and voices are validated by other perspectives, even those which appear contradictory. The restoried whole, in other words, could become a catalyst for a deep understanding of our common work, for moving forward together.

and--regarding the case in point--perhaps for envisioning a different story about the stability of classroom practice.

Narrative Development of My Story

The narrative structure in this report will contain the varying epistemological stances I've taken with respect to my responsibility as a literacy educator for elementary teachers--and describe the varying influences on my paradigm shifts. These retellings are supported by data from a line of separate investigations (reported elsewhere and summarized here) which illustrate the efficacy of each approach. Those studies looked at particular moments within this larger story to ask, "What are the outcomes of my work? How can I modify my instruction to more clearly impact my students' learning?" Using a narrative approach to synthesize the resultant stories across time becomes an analytic means of pointing out their common themes and lessons. To be certain that the synthesis accurately reflects the previously analyzed data, the reader could review complete texts from the earlier studies. However, the test of internal consistency in this personal story also rests on the coherence of the narrative--a felt sense which goes beyond the logic of method.

The narrative will describe various paradigm shifts which led to new perspectives on my sense of responsibility as a teacher educator. It tells the story of how I began my work with a sense of instructional responsibility to develop subject or content expertise in teachers, and the influences on a shift in responsibility to influence a transfer of that expertise to children. The conclusion of this narrative describes my responsibility as influencing epistemological change. Let me begin the story.

Part I: Responsibility as the Development of Expertise

In the initial days of my teacher education career--as a doctoral candidate instructor in reading at the University of Texas, Austin--my sense of responsibility was bounded by university classroom walls. Following timeless examples from my own educational experiences and new examples from research experiences required by my graduate program, I felt it was my duty to *cover the content* of reading instruction, then measure its mastery. I was influenced by the

information-processing models and schema-theoretic accounts of scholars such as Anderson and Pearson (1984) and Bransford (1979). My sense of appropriate pedagogy was influenced by the teaching effectiveness literature as reported by Brophy and Good (1986). From a yet-unarticulated and less well read place in me as a woman-teacher, I also felt an intuitive sense of responsibility to engage the young teachers-to-be who were not always interested in attending class. I assessed whether I had fulfilled my duties in that area subjectively by noting increased interest and attention in our work together. For the most part, though, I employed a traditional lecture, discussion, text-based teaching style to help them learn all the content I knew to be valuable. For example, I presented a theoretical umbrella of varying perspectives on reading and writing, then described the instructional strategies which grew out of the varying approaches. I recommended that they consider those appropriate for teaching their future students. I then used objective measures to define how well they'd learned what I'd taught. I did not worry much whether students would apply what they had learned in classrooms. Satisfactory pre-/post-measures of course content learned by more than 85% of my students let me put to rest my question of responsibility.

In Chapter II of my story as a teacher educator, now required to supervise student teachers as well as teach them, I began to explore notions of actually increasing content knowledge by taking advantage of the field experience. The boundaries of my sense of responsibility expanded to include both my new instructional assignment and a growing understanding of the social nature of learning; that is, I was now reading authors such as Vygotsky (1962) and Doyle (1983) to make sense of my teaching in this new context. I couldn't see the epistemological validity of such a perspective given my former classroom-bound teaching assignment where I could require little social interaction with children. Now, however, I evaluated the success of my approach by collecting data through course-based measures *and* on student teachers' classroom practica/performances.

As part of the semester-long elementary methods course, I now could ask students to apply what they were learning in class by working with children who had difficulty learning to read and write. Influenced by the research culture in my own institution, I also observed and recorded students' teaching and asked them to keep systematic records and prepare reports of children's progress. These data helped me evaluate the effectiveness of my approach. Here's an excerpt from Brenda Beams's (1986) report about her work with Gracie, an eight-year-old first-grade student from a Mexican-American migrant family:

> [Gracie joined my group] with two years of kindergarten behind her and still no letter-name or sight word knowledge. . . . All three children in Gracie's group (and their teacher!) read independent texts continuously for 20 minutes a day. . . . [Gracie] read and reread her stories, self-correcting her own mistakes. Through the successful repetition, she not only built-up a strong sight word knowledge, but was able to abstract phonetic cues (such as letter-sounds at the beginning of words) which she applied to other unknown words. In the remaining 25 minutes of our daily work together, she participated in choral rhyming activities to further develop her phonemic awareness, became an eager writer of her own text, listened to stories read to her, and slowly began to join our small group discussions about our reading. . . .
>
> Her success began to spread into other aspects of her life. At the end of our 45 minute session together, Grace rejoined others in a "readiness" group established by her classroom teacher. Near the middle of the semester she became--for the first time in her school career--a star. She was reading fluently as the rest of her group struggled. She was able to help her peers. Her status in the classroom changed. Gracie became a leader. . . . Her classroom teacher noticed that her new confidence also transferred to her efforts in mathematics work. [She later asked to learn about our approach. For more information, see Hollingsworth, 1988.]

Brenda's success with Gracie was much more meaningful to me as a teacher educator than were her perfect responses on a final examination over the literacy content. Similar findings from over 90% of the other preservice teachers in my class suggested to me that I had met my responsibility--as I then defined it--to have an impact on classroom practice. Ultimate transfer of this eclectic literacy approach to teachers' own classrooms *after graduation*, however, seemed beyond my absolute responsibility, given both my job description and my current research focus. Besides, I *assumed* that these well-informed teachers would transfer what they'd learned to their own classrooms.

Part II: Responsibility as Transfer to Classroom Practice

The next chapter of my story as a teacher educator began as I graduated and took a job as assistant professor at the University of California, Berkeley. My sense of responsibility again shifted to match the new environment. The graduate-level elementary teachers-to-be at UC, Berkeley, practice taught in classrooms as they studied with me over the course of a full year. To satisfy my interest in their learning to teach and to meet the requirements of a new professor to engage in a program of research, I collaborated with research assistants to study my teaching systematically as an influence on 28 new teachers' learning in two literacy courses (see Hollingsworth, 1989). We tape-recorded class sessions, conducted interviews, and collected written responses to simulations as evidence of the class members' evolving beliefs and understanding about literacy. The research assistants gave me formative reports of private interviews, which revealed general patterns of teachers' learning (to preserve their confidentiality), and then a summative report after the course ended. These collaborators and I also followed approximately one-third of new teachers into their practicum classrooms and wrote running narrative observations of their teaching. We did not supervise, coach, or evaluate but simply recorded what we noticed. We then analyzed those triangulated data across the course and classroom sites using Glaser and Strauss's (1967) constant comparison approach.

Like any teacher who has difficulty attending both to the flow of the lesson and the sense students make of it, I found this sort of pulling back to be very useful. Systematically analyzing these longitudinal data allowed me to become more precise in my understanding of preservice teachers' content learning. I began to see where the new teachers' attention rested and what seemed to be blocking their learning and transfer of literacy to classroom settings. I could see points at which they were learning to reify and stabilize classroom practice. Results of these analyses told me that these new teachers paid much more attention to the *activities* of reading instruction than to their purpose. They failed to question what sense children made of the activities, a prerequisite for flexible and responsive classroom practices. They assumed that

interesting and well-executed activities would motivate children to become literate. The results of this study influenced the next. In the subsequent chapter of my teaching story, I revised the course to have new teachers "pay attention to student learning." I reduced both the content density and the assignment loads to encourage the teachers to know and teach something well, then to look in classrooms and see if children learned from their teaching.

An example of my attempts to accomplish that shift and still provide a scaffolded but flexible activity structure was to introduce a framework for direct or explicit explanation based on children's metacognitive understanding of text (Duffy & Roehler, 1989). I hoped teachers would use that activity to determine the sense children made of their reading, incorporate varying reading strategies to meet particular children's needs, then guide the children to use the routine and clarify their own thinking. After modeling the approach with class members, I asked teachers to videotape themselves using a routine *modified to suit their particular children*, then to analyze the results and discuss them in class. My initial impression from those public displays led me to believe that students were moving in the direction I had hoped. However, Marcia Cantrell, a research assistant, also attended these public discussions, privately interviewed the teachers, triangulated their responses with their videotaped performances and audiotaped transcripts of the actual course content, and later wrote a report of their learning:

> One preservice teacher reported to me that many, including herself, "just did it, even though we didn't know WHAT we were doing." . . . [T]he sample of preservice teachers with which I spoke all reported that they *thought* they would use the framework in their teaching, but found the steps Dr. Hollingsworth required too cumbersome. The few that could articulate their modified plans left out guided practice and analysis. . . . Ironically, it is perhaps because Dr. Hollingsworth did not spend class time [guiding the teachers' practice] that the teachers did not see the usefulness and importance of this step. (Cantrell, 1988, pp. 11-12)

At the end of the course, I compared the *public* statements in the multiple data sources with the *private* data the research assistants collected, then combined course-specific findings with reports from practicum observations and follow-up surveys after graduation. Using a constant comparative analysis, I found little consistent evidence of either shifts of attention away from

existing classroom activities or a broadening of theoretical perspectives which would allow them to notice children who were not doing well. As a group, they tended to reify existing classroom practices.

To learn more, I continued to follow, observe, and interview eight teachers, roughly representative of the full sample of 28, into their second, third, and fourth years of teaching. I also asked them to meet with me and my research assistants every month and talk about their literacy practices. Tape recording and analyzing our conversations, then coding and comparing those results with the classroom and practicum-based data, I found evidence that seven out of eight had retained the dominant theory of learning emphasized in the course (a social-constructivist view based on the work of Vygotsky, 1978). I also learned that I had omitted attention to variables which they saw necessary for understanding and changing classroom practice: the inner-city environments, or hard-to-handle classrooms, to which beginning teachers were assigned; socialized or normative beliefs about teaching and learning which countered my suggestions; and the means of seeking continued education and support in those difficult beginning years.

I also found that I had taught them much more about research-based literacy content than they were able to process or remember. For example, four teachers could not remember particular strategies I'd covered in class, even when provided with evidence from course transcripts and their own interviews that they had "learned" those particular strategies earlier. Analyzing our work together during the first two years after graduation, I also found that until the new teachers had an opportunity to talk about their basic concerns with social interaction and relationship issues, seven out of eight teachers (those employed in inner-city classrooms) were not able to attend well to the content of literacy, much less attend to what students were learning from that content (see Hollingsworth, 1990b).

Part III: Responsibility as Feminist Epistemology

The result of such analyses led me to a new chapter in my career as a teacher educator. It appeared that to enable students to overcome both my own limitations within a university course

and the tremendous contextual influences to stabilize practice in schools, I would have to change radically my epistemological approach to their learning and my own practice. My new sense of responsibility as a teacher educator moved into the philosophical and moral realms. I no longer saw value in encouraging teachers to make cognitive changes by learning what works within the same paradigm. I wanted to move outside of the known into others worlds of possibility. I hoped we could expand our epistemological boundaries by first identifying the *public* and *private* paradigms for teaching and learning we used, then critiquing our own and others' ways of knowing. To begin this process, I asked teachers to own and articulate their practical experience as valid knowledge.

Having experiential knowledge validated by external authority sources is not a common experience for many adult women--nor to elementary school teachers, male or female. It is less stressful to defer to established knowledge and practice. To encourage the risk of self-authored knowledge as part of my teaching, I read scholarly works on women's epistemological and moral development (see Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986), feminist methodology (see Harding, 1987), and feminist pedagogy (see Weiler, 1988). I now encouraged teachers to develop a critical perspective of *teaching as research* through which they could *contain, evaluate, and create responsive literacy knowledge for particular schools and children.* Morally, I could not embrace related concepts such as "reflection-in-action," "inquiry," or "practical argument," because of their implications of some higher ranked and externally authored notion of "research."

This new definition of responsibility as epistemological development caused me to also change my teaching practices. I began to use principles of feminist pedagogy such as connected conversation, self-evaluation, continuous critique, shared agendas, and a valuing of specialized knowledge each of us brought to our relationships. In other words, *I* still had expert knowledge about literacy and each of my students had valuable forms of knowledge that I had shut out when I considered myself and my university colleagues the only experts. It was also clear that students had questions and misperceptions which I could not coach or guide because of the institutional

structure of separating course work from fieldwork. Thus, I invited their practice-based experiences into our course, asked teachers to identify research questions within them, then had us collectively work on methods for analyzing and solving those questions.

To meet this sense of responsibility, I moved externally authored text to a secondary position in favor of actual projects in progress and set up a loose framework for topical discussions about teaching as research. I strongly encouraged ownership of knowledge and theory or voice by minimizing the risk of failure. In an effort to remove attention to what research questions or procedures I might favorably evaluate and thus achieve the desired outcome of epistemological ownership and change, I allowed each teacher to self-evaluate their learning (classes usually decided on grades of "A" for everyone). Courses now developed through group consensus. We suspended attention to established literacy solutions or methodological procedures until we were clear about our own projects and questions, how those questions came from our own personal or private theories of teaching and learning, how they varied from public or external theories, and how teaching could be viewed as research.

An analysis of this process using a constant comparative approach showed that 95% of the teachers enrolled learned to identify specific problems in changing classroom practice which came from previously unvoiced ways-of-knowing, developed methods to collect information leading to a resolution, experimented with their findings, and reported the outcomes to the class. The problems and questions did not always directly involve the content of literacy instruction. Sometimes there were prerequisite problems requiring attention so that the teachers could then focus attention on literacy instruction and learning. Reflecting real practice dilemmas, teachers' studies most often involved looking closely at relationships with children (which is what I had wanted of previous classes) but also involved identifying, analyzing, and developing responses to other school-based obstacles which caused them to adopt and stabilize classroom practices (matching the public or dominant paradigm in vogue), regardless of the needs of children (see Hollingsworth, 1990a). An example might clarify this problem.

Lisa Raffel, a former student as a preservice teacher, was now enrolled at UC, Berkeley, through continuing education as a beginning fourth-grade teacher in a low-income school district. She had returned to work with me again because one-quarter of her children came to her classroom as nonreaders. Her story was one of teaching as research:

> [One of Lisa's concerns was getting her class's] attention when she was directing a lesson. In conversation with the others in the class, Lisa described her ideal classroom image in terms of standard classroom practices where children pay close attention to direct lessons from the teacher. . . .
>
> Lisa's words about her image did not match her own personal beliefs [or private paradigm] about classroom interaction [my classroom observations of her revealed her to be most comfortable with a less authoritarian style]. . . . When probed, she admitted that the order [she wanted to achieve was the standard in her school]. . . . I asked Lisa to suspend her "borrowed," external and standard image of classroom practice [or public paradigm] and to simply observe the class again. I videotaped her classroom as a demonstration for her and others in the class. Together we watched footage of Lisa's students at break time, then observed her calling them to order for literacy instruction, then saw them take a minute or two to settle down. . . . [In conversation with her peers, Lisa] began to realize that what she perceived as lack of focus was not such a problem when she broadened her image *to include herself* in relationship to the students. [She saw her reaction to their inattention as a defensive and distancing stance.] Re-examining the class with her revised image, she saw the children's behavior simply as their reflecting the individual differences she valued. She became more relaxed in her instructional approach with the children. They responded in kind . . . . [As a result of this and other similar analyses, Lisa] even modified the publicly accepted model for literacy instruction within the school to develop her students' competence in literacy. . . . Lisa reported the results of her changing classroom practices in literacy at an American Educational Research Association conference in Boston. (Raffel, 1990)

Lisa was not the only teacher of the eight I followed who shifted paradigms and changed existing classroom practice as beginning teachers. Five others could also successfully document such changes.

Discussion of Story Lessons

Obviously I could continue to add other chapters to the ongoing story. At this point, however, I'd like to step out of the narrative and discuss what I've learned. Specific findings noted refer to cross-case and cross-class analyses completed in the earlier investigations and summarized here.

The Power of Contextual and Paradigmatic Thought as Influences on Pedagogy

My initial sense of responsibility involved passing along what I knew from the experts to novices. The perspective was one of a professional duty or obligation--backed by positivistic arguments for information processing and the culture of my graduate education in educational psychology. As long as my teaching context remained stable, my own role or instructional stance also seemed to remain intact. I had no stimulus for change. In maintaining that stance, I also inadvertently modeled the retention of stable or unquestioning stances toward classroom practice.

As the boundaries of my literacy course broadened to include children, however, I could no longer meaningfully employ a single paradigm as the basis for my teaching, nor for evaluating other teachers' learning. Using the best expert knowledge of literacy theory and instruction was also insufficient to counteract my own pedagogical limitations and the full range of constraints against changing instructional norms that teachers found on the job. Therefore the approach developed for final chapters of my story was less one of knowledge transmission and outcome measurements and more that of cooperative and critical knowledge creation, with epistemological identification, critique, and shift as outcomes.

The Importance of Disequilibration Between Role Expectation, Paradigms and Reality: A Search for Self

Continuing to research and change my teaching created conflict about the appropriate role for myself as teacher. The changes I made were more than intellectual exercises. Both shifts in instructional study designs and interpretations came about because of a quest for meaning in my own life. For example, only when I realized my own need for connections and responsiveness in my personal life as a feminist scholar and the institutional constraints on my own teaching practices was I able to see the appropriateness of that role in my teaching and make a paradigm shift.

Teachers, too, needed to give voice to the role conflicts between internalized goals for care, connection, and inclusion and externalized expectations to be subject matter experts, rational disciplinarians, and dispassionate evaluators. With such self-knowledge as instructional content, the new feminist teachers (both male and female) were able to tap deeply submerged beliefs about

their roles, then naturally modify established classroom practices. The result was not only an ability to challenge standardized expectations, which did not seem appropriate for particular children or teachers, but a better balance of internal and external expectations as well.

The Breadth and Complexity of Knowledge Needed to Teach Literacy: More Than a Disciplinary Focus

As I examined the transfer of knowledge from the literacy course to the classroom, I learned that my preservice teachers couldn't assimilate and really didn't use all of the disciplinary knowledge I tried to teach them early in my story as a teacher educator. Systematic analyses of the data showed that they required more guided practice than I provided to learn new literacy content and strategies. Evidence from postcourse data showed that new teachers also required more opportunities to discuss and critique the existing literacy strategies and activities they were seeing as standard classroom practice. It wasn't enough to present research-based alternatives for fixed groups and prepackaged commercial instruction, for example. To critique and change existing practice, it was necessary to talk about standard practices with reference to personal experiences not yet in the literature which might replace them.

These new teachers came to understand values, caring, and relational interactions as content. Although I failed to address those issues in course work, they consistently came up as an important topics of concern after teachers were on the job. Most of the beginning teachers were placed in underfunded and undersupported schools, in communities with high crime rates where caring was important. Coming to terms with relational issues was critical if teachers were to remain in the classroom, let alone change existing practices. One member of our group stopped teaching before that could occur (but still came to our monthly meetings).

The Need for Alternative Forms of Course Design

To gain the depth of understanding necessary to acquire self-knowledge and effectively teach children, these teachers seemed to profit from the freedom from evaluation of what *I* knew as content knowledge. In order to obtain a good grade as preservice teachers, they often gave *my* knowledge back to me but failed to struggle with their own. I had to collect both privately held

evaluative knowledge as well as that more publicly displayed to evaluate their learning accurately. Having the opportunity to articulate and compare their own grounded beliefs as inservice teachers, to create their own knowledge, critique others, and evaluate their own growth seemed to facilitate their changing classroom practice.

These and previous findings could provide support for teacher education restructuring efforts such as are now occurring with the professional development school recommendations (see Holmes Group, 1990). Having teachers articulate their own paradigms and adopt a critical perspective of teaching as research could become a strand which is interwoven with subject specific domains and currently available knowledge bases.

The Reality of Resistance as Perspectives Change

Asking new teachers to look inward to understand and critique external data caused much discomfort and confusion. In preservice classes--scheduled before new teachers had opportunities for extensive teaching practice--resistance was heavy. The student-teachers wanted to focus on rehearsing and learning reading strategies. Their requests were not unreasonable given that they *did* need activities to teach.

As the research assistants helped me see, I actually set up a climate for resistance which I established in my single-minded and oppositional attempts. I wanted them to attend to students and remained fixed on that goal. I'd forgotten my earlier study findings that new teachers first attend to issues of management and subject (because of the immediacy of their job requirements), and only when those domains were integrated and routinized could they shift attention to children. Later, as I began to understand the conflict between the "expected" instructional role and my unvoiced values of caring and connection, I came to see that I needed to take their concerns into account. I began to both understand and model how to make authentic connections in the evolving relationships with my students. Then I was able to lead them into the world of discovery and research in a less forceful way.

However, because of the authenticity of our relationships, resistance and discomfort is still present in my classrooms. We are different people with differing values, backgrounds, and practical settings. But our teaching-research conversations--based on principles of care and response which shape feminist pedagogy and incorporate critical consideration of expert knowledge from silenced and differing epistemological perspectives--eventually provide most of us with both the safety and the disequilibration needed to challenge our classroom practices. With these teachers, I'm beginning to see how we might impact the history of classroom practice. I encourage others to bring their stories of changing practice to our conversation.

References

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research (pp. 829-864). New York: Longman.

Beams, B. (1986). Teaching Gracie to read. Unpublished class report, University of Texas, Austin.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Bond, G. L., & Dykstra, R. (1967). The cooperative research program in first-grade reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 2, 5-142.

Borrowman, M. (1965). Teacher education in America: A documentary history. New York. Teachers College Press.

Bransford, J. D. (1979). Human cognition: Learning, understanding and remembering. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan.

Cantrell, M. (1988). A reading course examined. Unpublished master's thesis. University of California, Berkeley.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1986). On narrative method, personal philosophy and narrative unities in the story of teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23, 293-310.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, and again, and again. Educational Researcher, 39(3), 4-12.

Doyle, W. (1983). Academic work. Review of Educational Research, 53, 159-199.

Duffy, G., & Roehler, L. (1989). The tension between information-giving and mediation: Perspectives on instructional explanation and teacher change. In J. Brophy (Ed.), Advances in research on teaching (Vol. 1, pp. 1-34). New York: JAI Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational Researcher, 15 (5), 5-12

Harding, S. (1987). Feminism and methodology. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hollingsworth, S. (1988). Making field-based programs work: A three-level approach to reading education. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (4), 28-37.

Hollingsworth, S. (1989). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. American Educational Research Journal, 26, 160-189.

Hollingsworth, S. (1990a). Coming to view teaching as research: A feminist perspective on an epistemological pedagogy for teacher educators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Educators, Chicago.

Hollingsworth, S. (1990b). Learning to teach literacy through collaborative conversation: A feminist pedagogy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Hollingsworth, S., Dybdahl, M., Lidstone, M.L., Minarik, L., Teel, K., Smallwood, J., & Weldon, A. (1991). Learning to teach literature in California: Challenging the rules for standardized instruction (Research Series No. 201). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Holmes Group (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Houston, W. R., Haberman, M., & Sikula, J. (1990). Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: Macmillan.

Keohane, N.O., Rosaldo, M. Z., & Gelpi, B.C. (1981). Feminist theory: A critique of ideology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lanier, J. E., & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. (3rd ed., pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Mitchell, W. J. T. (1980). On narrative. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Raffel, L. (1990, April). Reflections on learning to teach: A beginning teacher's view. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Thought and language. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Weiler, K. (1988). Women teaching for change: Gender, class and power. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Wittrock, M. C. (1986). Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K., & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.